

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 27-44 have been canceled. Claims 23, 45, and 53 have been amended. Claims 1-26 and 45-60 are currently pending in the application.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 23, 45, and 53 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner noted that some of the terms in the rejected claims lacked antecedent basis. Claims 23, 45, and 53 have been amended to rectify the antecedent basis problem. Accordingly, Applicants request that this rejection be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §102

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 45-49, 52-57 and 60 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Chen et al. (U.S. Pub. No. US2004/0119736). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 45

Claim 45 recites:

A machine-implemented method, comprising:
obtaining, from a server, a set of status information pertaining to one or more components;
rendering a display to show the status information for the one or more components;
accessing an event buffer, wherein the event buffer stores one or more events pertaining to the one or more components;
determining whether the event buffer contains any newly added events that

require the display to be updated;
in response to a determination that the event buffer contains one or more newly added events that require the display to be updated, obtaining from the server a set of updated status information pertaining to the one or more components; and
 rendering an updated display to show the updated status information for the one or more components. (Emphasis added)

Claim 45 provides an advantageous method for determining when to consult a server to obtain updated status information pertaining to one or more components. With the method of claim 45, it is possible to consult the server only when updated status information is available. By doing so, network traffic is kept to a minimum, and server resources are used more efficiently (i.e. the server is not invoked when no updated status information is available).

According to the method of claim 45, a set of status information pertaining to one or more components is obtained from a server. This set of status information is rendered in a display. The method thereafter accesses an event buffer, wherein the event buffer stores one or more events pertaining to the one or more components. A determination is made as to whether the event buffer contains any newly added events that require the display to be updated. In response to a determination that the event buffer does contain one or more newly added events that require the display to be updated, a set of updated status information pertaining to the one or more components is obtained from the server. An updated display is then rendered to show the updated status information for the one or more components. By obtaining the updated status information from the server in response to a determination that the event buffer contains one or more newly added events that require the display to be updated, the method of claim 45 consults the server when it is known that updated status information for the one or more components is available. By doing so, the

method of claim 45 keeps network traffic to a minimum, and uses the server resources more efficiently. Such a method is neither disclosed nor suggested by Chen.

Instead, Chen discloses a method for displaying events of a network device. In Chen, a network device 6 (Fig. 1 of Chen) is coupled to an administrative workstation 2 via a connection 4. The network device 6 has an event managing module 66 and a storage 68, and the administrative workstation 2 has an event obtaining module 24 and a database 28. In operation, the event managing module 66 detects events on the network device 6. When an event is detected, the event managing module 66 determines whether the event needs to be displayed (see paragraph 0022 of Chen). If the event needs to be displayed, then the event managing module 66 stores information pertaining to the event into the storage 68 (see paragraph 0022). Periodically, the event obtaining module 24 of the administrative workstation 2 accesses the storage 68 on the network device 6 (see paragraph 0021), and obtains information pertaining to a detected event (see paragraph 0022). The administrative workstation 2 stores this event information into the database 28, and displays the event information on an event information page (see paragraph 0022). By doing so, the administrative workstation 2 is able to detect and display events pertaining to the network device 6.

Several points should be noted with regard to Chen. First of all, it should be noted that, unlike claim 45, Chen makes absolutely no mention of a server from which status information pertaining to one or more components may be obtained. The storage 68 of Chen may be interpreted as the event buffer of claim 45 since storage 68 does contain information pertaining to events; however, there is nothing

in Chen that can reasonably be interpreted as the server recited in claim 45 from which status information pertaining to the one or more components may be obtained.

Another point to note is that, unlike claim 45, Chen neither discloses nor suggests obtaining a set of updated status information pertaining to the one or more components from a server in response to a determination that the event buffer contains one or more newly added events. In Chen, when the administrative workstation 2 detects event information in the storage 68, it simply takes that event information and displays it in an event information page. This is made perfectly clear at the end of paragraphs 0010 and 0022 of Chen. Unlike claim 45, the administrative workstation 2 of Chen does not, in response to a determination that the storage 68 contains one or more newly added events, obtain from a server a set of updated status information pertaining to the network device 6. In Chen, it is the event information that is displayed by the administrative workstation 2. Since this event information is already obtained from storage 68, there is no need for the administrative workstation 2 to consult any other component to obtain any other set of information. Thus, in sharp contrast to claim 45, the administrative workstation 2 of Chen does not obtain updated status information from a server, nor does it render this updated status information in a display.

In the Final Office Action, it appears that the Examiner is interpreting the storage 68 of Chen as both the event buffer and the server of claim 45, and the event information stored in the storage 68 of Chen as both the events and the status information of claim 45. This interpretation is untenable. Claim 45 makes it clear that the event buffer and the server are separate components: the event buffer is the component that stores the events and the server is the component from which status

information is obtained. That being the case, the event buffer and the server cannot be properly interpreted to be the same component, and the events and status information cannot be properly interpreted to be the same set of information. To do so would be tantamount to ignoring several explicit limitations of claim 45. This clearly would be improper.

As argued above, Chen fails to disclose or suggest at least several aspects of claim 45. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 45 is patentable over Chen.

Applicants further submit that claims 46-49 and 52, which depend from claim 45 and which recite further advantageous aspects of the invention, are likewise patentable over Chen for at least the reasons given above in connection with claim 45.

Claim 53

Claim 53 is an apparatus counterpart of method claim 45. Applicants submit that claim 53 is patentable over Chen for at least the reasons given above in connection with claim 45.

Applicants further submit that claims 54-57 and 60, which depend from claim 53 and which recite further advantageous aspects of the invention, are likewise patentable over Chen for at least the reasons given above in connection with claim 53.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11-13, 17-20, 22, 23, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Royce et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,748,884) in view of Chen. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites:

A system for event notification, comprising:
 an event buffer;
 a first node, the first node detecting a situation of interest on the first node and generating a first event in response thereto, the first node sending information pertaining to the first event to the event buffer to be stored therein; and
 a remote computing system, the remote computing system displaying a first set of status information for the first node that was previously obtained from a server, the remote computing system polling the event buffer for new events and in response to detecting the first event, the remote computing system interacting again with the server to obtain therefrom a set of updated status information for the first node, the remote computing system thereafter displaying the updated status information. (Emphasis added)

Claim 1 provides an advantageous system for determining when to interact with a server to obtain a set of updated status information for a node. By interacting with the server in response to detecting an event, the remote computing system interacts with the server when the status information for the node has been updated. That way, network resources are conserved (i.e. the remote computing system does not waste the server's time or the network's bandwidth by obtaining status information for the node when the status information has not been updated). Such a system is neither disclosed nor suggested by Royce and Chen, taken individually or in combination.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner admits that Royce fails to teach "a remote computing system...the remote computing system polling the event buffer for new events and in response to detecting the first event, the remote computing system interacting again with the server to obtain therefrom a set of updated status information for the first node, the remote computing system thereafter displaying the updated status information" (Emphasis added). The Examiner tries to compensate for Royce's

shortcomings by citing Chen. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Chen also fails to disclose or suggest the remote computing system of claim 1.

As argued above in connection with claim 45, the administrative workstation 2 of Chen (which the examiner is interpreting to be the remote computing system of claim 1) does not interact with a server in response to detecting an event in the storage 68 of the network device 6 (see Fig. 1 of Chen). Rather, when the administrative workstation 2 detects an event in the storage 68, it simply takes that event information and displays it in an event information page (see paragraphs 0010 and 0022 of Chen). There is absolutely no mention of the administrative workstation 2 interacting with a server to obtain a set of updated status information for the network device 6 in response to detecting an event in the storage 68. Furthermore, there is no mention of the administrative workstation 2 displaying updated status information. As noted above, it is the event information itself, not any updated status information pertaining to the network device 6, that is displayed by the administrative workstation 2. Since the administrative workstation 2 does not interact with a server to obtain a set of updated status information for the network device 6, it should come as no surprise that the administrative workstation 2 also does not display any such updated status information. For at least the above reasons, Applicants submit that Chen does not disclose or suggest the remote computing system of claim 1.

Since neither reference teaches or suggests at least the remote computing system of claim 1, even if the references were combined (assuming for the sake of argument that it would have been obvious to combine the references), the combination still would not yield the system of claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over Royce and Chen, taken individually or in combination.

Applicants further submit that claims 2, 6, 7, 11-13, and 17, which depend from claim 1, and which recite further advantageous aspects of the invention, are likewise patentable over Royce and Chen for at least the reasons given above in connection with claim 1.

Claim 18

Claim 18 recites:

A network for event notification, comprising:
 an event forwarding mechanism in each node of a cluster for forwarding detected events to each other node;
 an event buffer of said cluster to receive and store each event forwarded from a node from an event forwarding mechanism; and
 a remote event monitor for periodically polling said event buffer for changes in pertinent events, and in response to detecting one or more new pertinent events, the remote event monitor causing updated status information pertaining to one or more nodes in said cluster to be obtained from a server and causing the updated status information to be displayed.
 (Emphasis added)

Claim 18 provides an advantageous network for determining when to interact with a server to obtain updated status information for one or more nodes in a cluster. By interacting with the server in response to detecting one or more pertinent events, the remote event monitor interacts with the server when the status information for the one or more nodes has been updated. That way, network resources are conserved (i.e. the remote event monitor does not waste the server's time or the network's bandwidth by obtaining status information for the one or more nodes when the status information has not been updated). Such a network is neither disclosed nor suggested by Royce and Chen, taken individually or in combination.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner admits that Royce fails to teach "a remote event monitor for periodically polling said event buffer for changes in pertinent

events, and in response to detecting one or more new pertinent events, the remote event monitor causing updated status information pertaining to one or more nodes in said cluster to be obtained from a server and causing the updated status information to be displayed" (Emphasis added). The Examiner tries to compensate for Royce's shortcomings by citing Chen. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Chen also fails to disclose or suggest the remote event monitor of claim 1.

In contrast to the remote event monitor of claim 18, the administrative workstation 2 of Chen (which the examiner is interpreting to be the remote event monitor of claim 18) does not, in response to detecting one or more new pertinent events, cause updated status information pertaining to one or more nodes to be obtained from a server. Rather, when the administrative workstation 2 detects an event in the storage 68, it simply takes that event information and displays it in an event information page (see paragraphs 0010 and 0022 of Chen). There is absolutely no mention of the administrative workstation 2 causing updated status information pertaining to one or more nodes to be obtained from a server in response to detecting one or more new pertinent events. Furthermore, there is no mention of the administrative workstation 2 displaying updated status information. As noted above, it is the event information itself, not any updated status information pertaining to one or more nodes, that is displayed by the administrative workstation 2. Since the administrative workstation 2 does not interact with a server to obtain updated status information, it should come as no surprise that the administrative workstation 2 also does not display any such updated status information. For at least the above reasons, Applicants submit that Chen does not disclose or suggest the remote event monitor of claim 18.

Since neither reference teaches or suggests at least the remote event monitor of claim 18, even if the references were combined (assuming for the sake of argument that it would have been obvious to combine the references), the combination still would not yield the network of claim 18. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 18 is patentable over Royce and Chen, taken individually or in combination.

Applicants further submit that claims 19-20, 22, 23, and 25, which depend from claim 18, and which recite further advantageous aspects of the invention, are likewise patentable over Royce and Chen for at least the reasons given above in connection with claim 18.

Claims 3-5, 8-10, and 21

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3-5, 8-10, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Royce in view of Chen as applied to claims 1 and 18 above, and further in view of Labovitz et al. (U.S. Publication No. US2003/0037136). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is noted that claims 3-5 and 8-10 depend from claim 1, and claim 21 depends from claim 18. Thus, if it is shown that claims 1 and 18 are patentable over Royce, Chen, and Labovitz, then it logically follows that claims 3-5, 8-10, and 21 are likewise patentable over Royce, Chen, and Labovitz.

As argued above, Royce and Chen fail to disclose or suggest at least the remote computing system of claim 1. This same aspect of claim 1 is also not disclosed or suggested by Labovitz. Therefore, even if the references were combined (assuming for the sake of argument that it would have been obvious to combine the references), the combination still would not yield the system of claim 1. Thus, for at least this reason,

Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Royce, Chen, and Labovitz, taken individually or in combination.

Applicants further submit that claims 3-5 and 8-10, which depend from claim 1, and which recite further advantageous aspects of the invention, are likewise patentable over Royce, Chen, and Labovitz for at least the reasons given above in connection with claim 1.

With regard to claim 18, as argued above, Royce and Chen fail to disclose or suggest at least the remote event monitor of claim 18. This same aspect of claim 18 is also not disclosed or suggested by Labovitz. Therefore, even if the references were combined (assuming for the sake of argument that it would have been obvious to combine the references), the combination still would not yield the network of claim 18. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicants submit that claim 18 is patentable over Royce, Chen, and Labovitz, taken individually or in combination.

Applicants further submit that claim 21, which depends from claim 18, and which recites further advantageous aspects of the invention, is likewise patentable over Royce, Chen, and Labovitz for at least the reasons given above in connection with claim 18.

Claims 14-16 and 26

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 14-16 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Royce in view of Chen as applied to claims 1 and 18 above, and further in view of Heidingsfeld et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,823,359). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is noted that claims 14-16 depend from claim 1, and claim 26 depends from claim 18. Thus, if it is shown that claims 1 and 18 are patentable over Royce, Chen, and Heidingsfeld, then it logically follows that claims 14-16 and 26 are likewise patentable over Royce, Chen, and Heidingsfeld.

As argued above, Royce and Chen fail to disclose or suggest at least the remote computing system of claim 1. This same aspect of claim 1 is also not disclosed or suggested by Heidingsfeld. Therefore, even if the references were combined (assuming for the sake of argument that it would have been obvious to combine the references), the combination still would not yield the system of claim 1. Thus, for at least this reason, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Royce, Chen, and Heidingsfeld, taken individually or in combination.

Applicants further submit that claims 14-16, which depend from claim 1, and which recite further advantageous aspects of the invention, are likewise patentable over Royce, Chen, and Heidingsfeld for at least the reasons given above in connection with claim 1.

With regard to claim 18, as argued above, Royce and Chen fail to disclose or suggest at least the remote event monitor of claim 18. This same aspect of claim 18 is also not disclosed or suggested by Heidingsfeld. Therefore, even if the references were combined (assuming for the sake of argument that it would have been obvious to combine the references), the combination still would not yield the network of claim 18. Thus, for at least this reason, Applicants submit that claim 18 is patentable over Royce, Chen, and Heidingsfeld, taken individually or in combination.

Applicants further submit that claim 26, which depends from claim 18, and which recites further advantageous aspects of the invention, is likewise patentable over Royce, Chen, and Heidingsfeld for at least the reasons given above in connection with claim 18.

Claim 24

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Royce in view of Chen as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Villado et al. (U.S. Publication No. US2004/0111507). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is noted that claim 24 depends from claim 18. Thus, if it is shown that claim 18 is patentable over Royce, Chen, and Villado, then it logically follows that claim 24 is likewise patentable over Royce, Chen, and Villado.

As argued above, Royce and Chen fail to disclose or suggest at least the remote event monitor of claim 18. This same aspect of claim 18 is also not disclosed or suggested by Villado. Therefore, even if the references were combined (assuming for the sake of argument that it would have been obvious to combine the references), the combination still would not yield the network of claim 18. Thus, for at least this reason, Applicants submit that claim 18 is patentable over Royce, Chen, and Villado, taken individually or in combination.

Applicants further submit that claim 24, which depends from claim 18, and which recites further advantageous aspects of the invention, is likewise patentable over Royce, Chen, and Villado for at least the reasons given above in connection with claim 18.

Claims 50-51 and 58-59

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 50, 51, 58 and 59 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al in view of Heidingsfeld et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,823,359). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is noted that claims 50-51 depend from claim 45 and claims 58-59 depend from claim 53. Thus, if it is shown that claims 45 and 53 are patentable over Chen and Heidingsfeld, then it logically follows that claims 50-51 and 58-59 are likewise patentable over Chen and Heidingsfeld.

As argued above, Chen fails to disclose or suggest at least one aspect of claims 45 and 53. This same aspect of claims 45 and 53 is also not disclosed or suggested by Heidingsfeld. Therefore, even if the references were combined (assuming for the sake of argument that it would have been obvious to combine the references), the combination still would not yield the invention as claimed in claims 45 and 53. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicants submit that claims 45 and 53 are patentable over Chen and Heidingsfeld, taken individually or in combination.

Applicants further submit that claims 50-51 and 58-59, which depend from claims 45 and 53, respectively, and which recite further advantageous aspects of the invention, are likewise patentable over Chen and Heidingsfeld for at least the reasons given above in connection with claims 45 and 53.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this amendment be entered and made of record, and that a notice of allowance be issued.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss any issues that may advance prosecution.

No fee is believed to be due specifically in connection with this Reply. To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee that may be due in connection with this Reply to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: January 21, 2008

/BobbyKTruong#37499/

Bobby K. Truong
Reg. No. 37,499

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1089
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext. 234
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076